

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-23, 25, and 28-39 are all the claims presently pending in this application. Claims 1-15, 28, and 31-38 have been amended to more particularly define the invention. Claims 16, 24, 26, and 27 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,651) in view of Montlick (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,446). Claims 4-6, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Gourdol (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,946). Claims 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Mori (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,084). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol, and further in view of Mori. Claims 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"). Claims 18, 22, 23, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Igarashi et al (Applicant's Cited Prior Art: "An Architecture for Pen-based Interaction on Electronic Whiteboards"). Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Fenster et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,454,371). Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,249,296). Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, and the AAPA. Claims 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick, and further in view of Frasca Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,506). Claims 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, the AAPA, and Frasca Jr. Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, Mori, Igarashi, Frasca Jr., and Tanaka. Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, Mori, and Frasca Jr. Claims 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, Mori, Frasca Jr., and Igarashi.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention (e.g. as recited in claim 1) is directed to an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method including the input/display device receiving the input stroke information by handwriting, the handwriting including directly touching a surface of the display means with the input means, the input/display device including a liquid-crystal pen-tablet unit, the liquid crystal pen-table unit

including the input means and the display means integrally combined, the input means including a pen-tablet pointer having a pen shape, the display means being one of a liquid-crystal display and a plasma display panel, first storing the input stroke information in a vector representation in the storage using the display data generation controller, displaying the input stroke information on the display using the display data generation controller, first determining whether a data identifier has been received in the input stroke information, the storage data update controller performing the first determining such that if the data identifier is received in the input stroke information, then the first determining includes searching for an intra-identifier code according to the data identifier and free input, the storage data update controller performing the searching, and data-identifier recording the intra-identifier code, the storage data update controller performing the data-identifier recording, free-input recording the free input, the storage data update controller performing the free-input recording, enabling the user to save the intra-identifier code and the free input in the storage substantially all as medical data, the input means moving in a sliding manner on a sheet label displayed at a particular position on a screen by the display means, the input/display device reading, when the input means moves onto the sheet label, data stored in the storage in relation to the sheet label from the storage, and displaying the data by conducting a change-over operation for the sheet label, second determining whether the intra-identifier code and the free input are saved in the storage, the second determining using the storage data update controller to control the second determining such that, if the intra-identifier code and the free input are not saved in the storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then the restoring operation includes third determining whether a first change in the storage has occurred, returning to the input/display device receiving the input stroke information to repeat the application method up to the second determining if the first change in the storage has occurred, and first ending the application method if the first change in the storage has not occurred, declaring a falsification of the intra-identifier code and the free input to be impossible if the restoring

operation is not conducted, fourth determining whether a second change in the storage has occurred, second ending the application method if the second change in the storage has not occurred, and if the second change in the storage has occurred, generating a copy of the storage without the intra-identifier code and the free input storage, recording the second change in the storage, and ending the application method.

The conventional methods of supporting a medical treatment system are very technologically diverse. Written notes allow the operator to store thoughts, impressions, and diagnoses in a medium which is flexible to power requirements and is extremely mobile. Notes can also be taken electronically and stored in a central location. There are significant problems with each medium of medical treatment system. Notes that are written on paper are subject to several drawbacks, which include lack of organization, misplacement, incorrect filing, faulty handwriting character determination, and easy destructability. Electronic notes are often taken through the utilization of a pen device with an electronic tablet. The operator that takes electronic notes in this conventional method experiences an interruption in thought due to the necessity of operating various menus and buttons which enable the taking of electronic notes. The conventional electronic medical treatment support system method also interrupts the thinking of the operator, especially when forced to think about operating the system instead of diagnosing the patient. Conventional methods also utilize systems in which the display and input are apart, causing a necessity to constantly and alternately refer to both the input device and display device instead of focusing on the diagnosis. Electronic methods do not use independent devices and need the addition of certain input elements to make the conventional medical treatment system method complete (Application at pages 1-5).

On the other hand, the exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention includes an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means,

the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method including second determining whether the intra-identifier code and the free input are saved in the storage, the second determining using the storage data update controller to control the second determining such that, if the intra-identifier code and the free input are not saved in the storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then the restoring operation includes third determining whether a first change in the storage has occurred, returning to the input/display device receiving the input stroke information to repeat the application method up to the second determining if the first change in the storage has occurred, and first ending the application method if the first change in the storage has not occurred (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

This exemplary feature may provide a benefit over conventional written and electronic note-taking devices by enabling the operator to enter handwritten strokes without using a button or a menu, in which the medical treatment system determines the meaning or relevance of the handwritten strokes and performs actions related to the meaning or relevance of the handwritten stroked after the determination (Application at page 32, lines 2-10).

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. The Alleged Weber and Montlick Combination

Weber discloses a user-interactive method for use in a processor controlled machine (Weber at Abstract). Montlick discloses a method and system for wireless remote information retrieval and pen-based data entry (Montlick at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that the combination of Weber and Montlick makes the claimed invention obvious.

However, even assuming (arguendo) the one of ordinary skill in the art would combine Weber and Montlick, the resultant combination still fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, the alleged combination fails to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

As previously stated, this exemplary feature may provide a benefit over conventional written and electronic note-taking devices by enabling the operator to enter handwritten strokes without using a button or a menu, in which the medical treatment system determines the meaning or relevance of the handwritten strokes and performs actions related to the meaning or relevance of the handwritten stroked after the determination (Application at page 32, lines 2-10).

The Examiner alleges that Weber teaches “determining whether an identifier (Fig. 4, elements 84, 88, and 92; called a ‘key identifier’) has been received in said input stroke information (Fig. 3, element 50; col. 12, line 54 – col. 13, line 2)” (Office Action at page 4, point 3). However, Weber fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned second determining of the claimed invention.

The Examiner does not allege that Montlick teaches or suggests any features with respect to the determination. The Examiner alleges that Montlick teaches a pen based input data entry system for storing substantially all medical data at column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 2 (Office Action at page 5, first full paragraph).

Regardless, Montlick clearly fails to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system including second determining whether the intra-identifier code and the free input are saved in the storage, the second determining using the storage data update controller to control the second determining such that, if the intra-identifier code and the free input are not saved in the storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then the restoring operation includes third determining whether a first change in the storage has occurred, returning to the input/display device receiving the input stroke information to repeat the application method up to the second determining if the first change in the storage has occurred, and first ending the application method if the first change in the storage has not occurred.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. The Gourdol Reference

To make up for the deficiencies of the alleged Weber and Montlick combination, the Examiner applies Gourdol. Gourdol discloses a method and apparatus for recognizing a gesture input on a display screen of a computer system (Gourdol at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that the

combination of Gourdol and the alleged Weber and Montlick combination teaches the claimed invention.

However, Gourdol fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that column 5, lines 53-67 of Gourdol teaches the identification of handwriting data as input stroke information and the conversion of that data into character data for output as text on a display (Office Action at page 7, fourth paragraph). However, Gourdol clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A. Gourdol simply suggests detecting data pen input and normalizing input so that it might be displayed accurately (Gourdol at Abstract).

Thus, Gourdol fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

C. The Mori Reference

To make up for the deficiencies of the alleged Weber and Montlick combination, the Examiner applies Mori. Mori discloses a method, system, apparatus, and computer program product that provides users of programmed applications with a visual indication of a state relating to the datasets accessed by the application (Mori at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that the combination of Mori and other applied prior art references, such as Weber and Montlick, teaches the claimed invention.

However, Mori fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method "comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to

said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred^d”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that “Mori teaches a method of accessing previously stored information files and when a file has been set to an unchangeable state, providing a visual item indicating the data cannot be displayed” at Figure 4b (Office Action at page 8, third paragraph). However, Mori clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, Mori fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

D. The Igarashi Reference

Igarashi discloses an augmented whiteboard interface designed for informal office work (Igarashi at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that Igarashi would have been combined with other applied prior art references to teach the claimed invention.

However, Igarashi fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input

are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred", as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that "Igarashi discloses a method of splitting segments on a pen based input system by providing a vertical line across an input field" at Figure 2 and Section 3.1 (Office Action at page 10, third paragraph). However, Igarashi clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, Igarashi fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

E. The Fenster Reference

Fenster discloses a three-dimensional ultrasound imaging system (Fenster at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that Fenster would have been combined with other applied prior art references to teach the claimed invention.

However, Fenster fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke

information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that Fenster discloses a medical imaging system where images can be manipulated and measured using points defined by the user input device (Office Action at page 12, fourth paragraph). However, Fenster clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, Fenster fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

F. The AAPA Reference

The Examiner alleges that the AAPA would have been combined with other applied prior art references to teach the claimed invention. However, the AAPA fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a

medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that the AAPA discloses a technique being analogous to the drag and drop feature located in the Windows OS (Office Action at page 16, second paragraph). However, the AAPA clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, the AAPA fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

G. The Tanaka Reference

Tanaka discloses an information processing apparatus for controlling window positions (Tanaka at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that Tanaka would have been combined with other applied prior art references to teach the claimed invention.

However, Tanaka fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method “comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred”, as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner alleges that Tanaka discloses a gesture based input system for a pen based input system, allowing a new window to open after the execution of a dragging operation of an icon on the screen (Office Action at page 13, fourth paragraph). However, Tanaka clearly fails to teach or

suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, Tanaka fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

H. The Frasca Jr. Reference

Frasca Jr. discloses an outpatient care data system (Frasca Jr. at Abstract). The Examiner alleges that Frasca Jr. would have been combined with other applied prior art reference to teach the claimed invention.

However, Frasca Jr. fails, even assuming (arguendo) combination with Weber and Montlick, to teach or suggest an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system including an input/display device, a storage, and a controller, the input/display device including input means and display means, the storage including a first database that stores a history of input stroke information automatically and a second database that stores explicit saving operations initiated by a user, the input stroke information including handwritten strokes, the controller including a display data generation controller, a storage data update controller, and a print data generation controller, the method "comprising . . . second determining whether said intra-identifier code and said free input are saved in said storage, said second determining using said storage data update controller to control said second determining such that, if said intra-identifier code and said free input are not saved in said storage, a restoring operation is conducted, then said restoring operation comprises: third determining whether a first change in said storage has occurred; returning to said input/display device receiving said input stroke information to repeat said application method up to said second determining if said first change in said storage has occurred; and first ending said

application method if said first change in said storage has not occurred", as recited, for example, in claim 1 (Application at Figure 4, page 19, line 3 to page 20, line 11).

The Examiner specifically alleges that Frasca Jr. teaches providing identifier codes that identify the input operator of a data record (Office Action at page 18, first paragraph). However, Frasca Jr. clearly fails to teach or suggest the second determining of the claimed invention and as described with respect to Weber in Section A.

Thus, Frasca Jr. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Weber and Montlick regarding the claimed invention as described in Section A. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-15, 17-23, 25, and 28-39, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: December 15, 2008



Christopher R. Monday
Reg. No. 60,929

Sean M. McGinn
Reg. No. 34,386

McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254